UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,499	03/25/2004	Hidekazu Miyairi	0756-7275	5721

31780 7590 06/25/2007

ERIC ROBINSON
PMB 955
21010 SOUTHBANK ST.
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165

EXAMINER	
WEST, JEFFREY R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2857	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

TH

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,499	MIYAIRI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey R. West	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *83* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 May 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/17/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,3,11,18,26,28,32,34,37,39,42,44,45,47,50,52,53,55,58,60,69,71,74,76,77,79,82 and 83.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1,3,11,18,26,28,32,34,37,39,42,44,45,47,50,52,53,55,58,60,69,71,74,76,77,79, and 82.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 19, 2007, has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 34, 39, 71, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,975,386 to Tsumura et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,148 to Ozawa et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0041226 to Tanaka et al.

With respect to claim 3, Tsumura discloses a method for testing comprising irradiating a visible light on a surface of a semiconductor film (column 3, lines 46-53) of which the crystallinity is improved by irradiating an energy beam (column 7, lines 12-20), photo-transferring a scattered light of the irradiated visible light to form an image (column 10, lines 41-53), and analyzing regions of the image to discriminate regions of luminance (column 10, lines 1-12).

With respect to claim 71, Tsumura discloses testing each of a plurality of semiconductor films crystallized by an energy beam (column 9, lines 48-57) having a different density (column 11, lines 53-58) and determining an irradiation energy density by a result of the testing to crystallize a semiconductor film (column 12, lines 10-18).

With respect to claim 34, Tsumura discloses that the energy beam is a laser light (column 12, lines 16-18).

With respect to claim 39, Tsumura discloses that the visible light has such light source as a halogen lamp (column 10, lines 57-62).

Tsumura also discloses a method for testing a beam profile comprising irradiating an energy beam on a substrate on which an amorphous semiconductor film (column

4, lines 62-66) is formed (column 7, lines 12-20), irradiating a visible light on a surface of the substrate (column 3, lines 46-53) and photo-transferring the scattered light to form an image (column 10, lines 41-53), and analyzing regions of the image to discriminate regions of luminance (column 10, lines 1-12) to test a profile of the energy beam (column 9, lines 48-57, column 11, lines 53-58, and column 12, lines 10-18).

As noted above, the invention of Tsumura teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura does teach determining defects caused by changes in observed luminance/intensity reflectance in a surface image (column 7, line 55 to column 8, line 13 and column 10, lines 1-12), Tsumura does not include the specifics on how the image discriminator determines locations of the defects.

Ozawa teaches a boundary line detecting method to determine areas with differences in light reflectance on a device surface (column 5, lines 12-17) comprising a camera to take a photograph of reflected light (column 6, lines 5-9), digitizing the photographed image to make a digital image (column 7, lines 63-65), and calculating an average luminance of the digital image (column 8, lines 16-20) by a computer (column 5, lines 60-63), sectioning basic units consisting of m rows and n columns by dividing the digital image into n in the X direction and m in the Y direction in a predetermined analysis range (column 7, lines 25-31 and 59-63 and Figure 4A), calculating/testing average values of luminances of the n basic units aligned in the X direction per each of the m rows aligned in the Y direction (column

8, lines 16-20), obtaining an approximate line from relations between the positions in the Y direction and the average values of the luminance corresponding to the positions in the Y direction, and testing the device surface using a fluctuation obtained from relations between the approximate line and the average values of the luminance (column 8, lines 3-20 and Figure 4C).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura to include the specifics on how the image discriminator determines locations of the defects, as taught by Ozawa, because Ozawa suggests a corresponding method for determining borders caused by variations in brightness (column 5, lines 12-17), as applicable to the defect detection invention of Tsumura, that would have improved the accuracy of the defect detection by employing a method that is not limited by the arrangement of the photodetectors of the detection apparatus (column 2, lines 55-61).

As noted above, the invention of Tsumura and Ozawa teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura and Ozawa does teach calculating average values of the luminance corresponding to the positions in the Y direction of a surface scanned by an energy beam, the combination does not explicitly indicate that the measurement is to be performed in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction of the light.

Tanaka teaches a method and device for exposure control comprising scanning reticle stage in an x-direction using a light source (0129, lines 1-13), receiving reflected light (0131, lines 1-7) and measuring a distribution of luminance (0321,

lines 1-8) wherein the measurement is performed in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction of the light (0322, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura and Ozawa to explicitly indicate that the measurement is to be performed in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction of the light, as taught by Tanaka, because, as suggested by Tanaka, the combination would have improved the measurement of Tsumura and Ozawa by canceling any irregularity of luminance measured in the scanning direction caused by the scanning itself (0322, lines 1-5).

With respect to claim 79, since the invention of Tsumura teaches performing testing by employing a plurality of components in a crystallization chamber/container (column 6, lines 53-54) and the invention of Ozawa teaches including a means for photographing the scattered light as part of the components for testing, the combination would have provided a means for photographing the scattered light in a crystallization chamber.

5. Claims 1, 11, 18, 32, 37, 69, and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al. and Tanaka et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0228526 to Lin et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa and Tanaka teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa,

and Tanaka does teach measuring averages of luminance of an image to determine variations of a surface illuminated by a multi-color light source (Tsumura; column 10, lines 57-59), the combination does not specify determining a corrected saturation value for the image.

Lin teaches a system and method for color characterization using fuzzy pixel classification with application in color matching and color match location comprising means for inspecting a surface of an object (0003, lines 7-12) by dividing an image into regions of interest (0038, lines 1-12) and measuring a saturation value for the image (0112, lines 1-15) that has been corrected/normalized to a range from 0 to 255 (0110, lines 8-11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka to specify determining a corrected saturation value for the image, as taught by Lin, because the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka does teach measuring averages of luminance of an image to determine variations of a surface illuminated by a multi-color light source and Lin suggests a corresponding method that would have improved the inspection method of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka by determining saturation values useful in inspecting colored surfaces, such as the surface colored by the multi-color light source of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka, and provided increased accuracy in surface inspection by measuring saturation values that provide more information regarding color variations (0004, lines 1-10 and 0006, line 1 to 0007, line 8).

6. Claims 47 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al. and Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa and Tanaka teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka does teach applying a visible light to the surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Ozawa and Tanaka does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka (0052, lines 1-9).

7. Claims 45 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al. Tanaka, and Lin and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin does teach applying a visible light to the surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin (0052, lines 1-9).

8. Claims 28, 44, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al. and Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,861,614 to Tanabe et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa and Tanaka teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka does teach a method for testing a beam profile by irradiating a laser energy beam on a substrate on which an amorphous semiconductor film is formed, the combination does not specify that the laser is applied as a pulse.

Tanabe teaches an S-System for the formation of a silicon thin film and a semiconductor-insulating film interface comprising performing laser-induced crystallization using a laser pulse (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka to specify that the laser is applied as a pulse, as taught by Tanabe, because the combination, as suggested by Tanabe, would have provided a conventional method to enable one having ordinary skill in the art to carry out the crystallization improvement of Tsumura, Ozawa, and Tanaka thereby providing results in accordance with convention (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

9. Claims 26, 42, 74, and 82, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al., Tanaka, and Lin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,861,614 to Tanabe et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura,

Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin does teach a method for testing a beam profile by irradiating a laser energy beam on a substrate on which an amorphous semiconductor film is formed, the combination does not specify that the laser is applied as a pulse.

Tanabe teaches an S-System for the formation of a silicon thin film and a semiconductor-insulating film interface comprising performing laser-induced crystallization using a laser pulse (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin to specify that the laser is applied as a pulse, as taught by Tanabe, because the combination, as suggested by Tanabe, would have provided a conventional method to enable one having ordinary skill in the art to carry out the crystallization improvement of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Lin thereby providing results in accordance with convention (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

10. Claims 52 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al., Tanaka, and Tanabe and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa, Tanaka, and Tanabe teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Tanabe does teach applying a visible light to the

surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Tanabe to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Tanabe does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, and Tanabe (0052, lines 1-9).

11. Claims 50 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Ozawa et al., Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Ozawa, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe does teach applying a visible light to the

surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Ozawa, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe (0052, lines 1-9).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed March 19, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As an initial matter, the Examiner maintains the withdrawal of claim 83 as Applicant's Response to Election filed November 07, 2005, indicated that claim 83 was not elected and the Non-Final Office Action mailed January 26, 2006, indicated

that claim 83 was withdrawn. It is also noted that claim 83 is a duplicate of its parent claim 77.

Applicant argues:

> Ozawa merely discloses an XO position having a maximum of added value derived luminance values to specify the boundary line in Figure 4. That is, Ozawa appears to teach electing an X coordinate position of "154" having a position XO (a peak position) having the maximum of added value derivated luminance values (or a mean value) to specify the boundary line (Figure 4, column 8 lines 3-20). However, Ozawa does not teach or suggest testing the crystallinity of a semiconductor film, of which the crystallinity is improved, using a fluctuation obtained from relations between an approximate line and average values.

The Examiner asserts that the limitation in question requires "testing the crystallinity of the semiconductor film, of which the crystallinity is improved, using a fluctuation obtained from relations between the approximate line and the average values."

With Tsumura disclosing testing the crystallinity of a semiconductor film, of which the crystallinity is improved, Ozawa is relied upon for teaching image discriminations using a fluctuation obtained from relations between the approximate line and the average values.

Ozawa discloses:

> In each of the rows corresponding to X coordinate positions "151," "152," . . . of the unit blocks arranged in Y direction, that is, in each of the row with peak values positioned therein on the image and the rows adjacent thereto, the luminances of unit blocks are added.

> FIG. 4C represents added luminance values graphically with respect to each of the rows arranged in Y direction. In each of the rows of X coordinate positions "151," "152," "153," luminance values are added and then compared for each row. In the same figure, if a curved line connecting the added values is drawn, a peak position (a predicted peak position) of that curved line can be specified to be the position of the boundary line of the slider edge portion X0.
>
> Alternatively, there may be adopted a method wherein, in each of the rows extending in Y direction, a mean luminance value in unit blocks pixels) is determined to draw the curved line shown in FIG. 4C, and a peak value of the curved line is specified to be the position of the edge portion X0.

As can be seen by these cited sections, Ozawa discloses obtaining an approximate line from relations between positions in the Y direction and the average values corresponding to the positions in the Y direction (i.e. obtaining a plurality averages, each illustrated by the circles in Figure 4C, and based on relations between the positions corresponding to the values and the obtained averages, connecting the circles to obtain an approximate line) and testing the device surface using a fluctuation obtained from relations between the approximate line and the average values (i.e. from the approximate line formed using the plurality of average values, determining a fluctuation/peak in the approximate line for testing the device surface).

Applicant argues:

> The Official Action has not shown that Ozawa is in the field of applicant's endeavor or that Ozawa is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant is concerned. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that a positioning method for a magnetic head body for a hard disk device is not reasonably pertinent to Tsumura or Tanaka or the features of the present invention, and the Official Action has not demonstrated why one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the present invention would have necessarily looked to Ozawa in order to improve Tsumura or Tanaka.

The Examiner asserts that Ozawa discloses:

> The present invention relates to a boundary line detecting method for specifying, by image processing, a boundary line between areas different in reflected light intensity, as well as a positioning method and apparatus for positioning, using the detecting method, for example a magnetic head body for a hard disk device and a support member such as a load beam relative to each other.

Therefore, while Ozawa does mention magnetic head positioning, Ozawa's disclosure focuses on solving the problem of detecting areas of a surface using differences in reflected light intensity. Such a disclosure is reasonably pertinent to the disclosure of Applicant's specification, Tsumura, and Tanaka.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,835,614 to Aoyama et al. teaches an image processing apparatus.

U.S. Patent No. 5,091,963 to Litt et al. teaches a method and apparatus for inspecting surfaces for contrast variations.

U.S. Patent No. 6,836,532 to Durst et al. teaches a diffraction system for biological crystal screening.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. West whose telephone number is (571)272-2226. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on (571)272-7925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. West
Primary Examiner
Art Unit – 2857

June 21, 2007